

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to again discuss Pakistani government transfer of nuclear technology to rogue nations such as North Korea, Iran and Libya.

Pakistan's behavior has been publicized for months and months, but all of the blame for nuclear exchange has thus far been placed on the scientists involved, particularly Abdul Qadeer Khan at the Khan Research Laboratories. Although criminal action has been pursued against Khan, I have remained very concerned over President Musharraf's and his senior advisors' direct role in assisting covert nuclear weapons programs in North Korea, Iran, and Libya.

In the past few days, scientists involved in the Pakistani nuclear program as well as opposition leaders in the Pakistani Parliament have charged that Musharraf, in fact, had knowledge of the nuclear exchange, and the Pakistani military was directly involved. Mr. Speaker, I am simply outraged. Musharraf likely knew that the exchanges took place, and is not being honest about his connection to the activity at the Khan Research Laboratories. He is stretching the truth in order to protect himself as well as his relationship to the United States, and to guarantee the continued flow of military funding from international sources, including the United States.

In the past, I have requested that President Bush reimpose Symington sanctions on Pakistan. Under the 1977 Symington amendment, these sanctions were imposed banning Pakistan from receiving economic and military assistance as a result of importing uranium enrichment technology. After 9/11, this ban was waived by President Bush. Given the evidence, in combination with Musharraf's intent to deceive us about his knowledge of Pakistan's exports of nuclear technology, I feel that it is more important than ever for President Bush to reimpose Symington sanctions. Furthermore, it is imperative that the United States stop providing military assistance to Pakistan until democracy is restored and terrorist violence in Kashmir comes to an end.

Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has been an ally in the war against global terror, but the United States and Pakistan are at a crossroads. Pakistan's government's participation in nuclear exchange, under Musharraf, has helped to create a nuclear black market in Iran, Libya and North Korea to thrive. I shouldn't even have to mention the devastating effects of uranium enrichment materials falling into the hands of terrorist groups, but this in fact is a concern that has been facilitated by Pakistan.

The Bush administration has been praising Musharraf for removing Dr. Khan from his position as advisor to the Pakistani Prime Minister, but it is high time that the administration open its eyes to the reality of the situation and take immediate action against Pakistan.

WHERE IS THE COMPASSION?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today the majority of Republicans in this House voted against extending unemployment benefits. Every single Democrat voted to extend unemployment benefits. Let me say that again. Today the majority of Republicans in this House, which is

supposed to be the people's House, voted against extending unemployment benefits. Every single Democrat voted to extend unemployment benefits.

How hopelessly out of touch with reality these House Republicans and their majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) are. Have they not noticed the jobless recovery?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said he would not support extending unemployment benefits. Let me remind him, unemployment benefits are earned benefits.

Every day our office gets phone calls from constituents asking whether Congress will extend their unemployment benefits, earned benefits. We are getting so many calls because hundreds of thousands of Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits and they have not been able to find new jobs.

In our community Sunoco advertised for 10 jobs, and over 2,000 people applied. This week in my district another company is shutting down, Georgia Pacific, Dixie Cups, over 207 more jobs gone.

The good jobs just are not coming on line. The President says, bring it on. Well, I say, bring on the jobs. Where are they? So through no fault of their own, 9.1 million Americans are out of work. And with each passing month more and more of these unemployed Americans take a step closer to the brink as they find themselves not only out of work but also out of unemployment benefits which they have earned. No pay check coming in, bills to pay, no new jobs on the horizon, trying to hang on, and now no unemployment check. That is due to a Republican Congress that does not care.

Mr. Speaker, we all heard President Bush back when he was running as a moderate talking about compassionate conservative. Mr. Speaker, where is the compassion? People are getting desperate, but the Republicans in Congress are turning a deaf ear to their cries. Look what the Republican leadership did here today, voting no, the majority of Republicans voting no to extend unemployment benefits.

House Republican leaders said here tonight, there is no problem with no jobs. Just go out and try to find some. That is right. The Republican line is that the economy is back and there is no reason to pass unemployment benefits. They are so hopelessly out of touch.

George W. Bush is the first President since Herbert Hoover who has lost more jobs than he has created. Where is the compassion for the 395,000 workers who exhausted their regular unemployment benefits on December 22, just before Christmas? Or what about the 400,000 workers who exhausted their benefits last month, the largest number of workers ever to exhaust unemployment benefits this past January?

The pain inflicted by the Bush administration's economic policies has spread from coast to coast. Hardest hit

is North Carolina. More unemployed workers are expected to exhaust their jobless benefits than any other State, over 61,000 workers.

□ 1930

In nine States, the number of unemployed workers who will exhaust their regular benefits will set a new record. North Carolina, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Indiana, South Carolina, Idaho, Vermont, Arkansas, where is the compassion for people in these States?

In 10 other States, the number of unemployed workers who will exhaust their regular benefits by summer will be the second highest on record: California; New York; Texas, where the majority leader is from; Ohio; Illinois; New Jersey; Wisconsin; Connecticut; Arizona; Nevada.

More than half the unemployed workers cut back on spending for food and more than half postponed medical or dental appointments. Without unemployment benefits, almost half the long-term unemployed workers would be in poverty. With unemployment benefits, only 19 percent would fall into poverty. Why is there not a resounding number of Republican Members who see extending unemployment benefits, which are earned benefits, as a matter of compassion?

They are so hopelessly out of touch. I hope that the American people will write the Members of the other body, the Senators, and tell them to pass an extension of unemployment benefits. That is our hope now that the majority of Democrats in this House have sent that bill for their approval.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE NATION'S PROGRESS IN THE WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening with my fellow colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to discuss our Nation's progress in the war in Iraq.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor those soldiers who have paid the ultimate price of war through the sacrifice of their own lives. I continue to pray for their families and friends who are struggling to cope with their grief and loss.

I also pay tribute to the soldiers who have returned from Iraq, forever changed as a result of injuries sustained during their tour of duty. Just a week or so ago, I visited Walter Reed Army Hospital and looked into the faces of young 19 and 20 year olds as they told stories as to how they lost their legs or lost their arms or lost their hands. I said to one young man, How do you handle this? I mean, looking at your life and where you go from here, how do you handle this? He said, Well, I simply look at it as a day's work. As I stood there, I could not help but think about the fact that this young man, if he were to live another 50 years, will be living without a leg and without an arm. So we pay special tribute to these young people, many of whom just came out of high school, fighting a war.

So often, Mr. Speaker, the stories of the men and women performing their daily operations in Iraq get lost as we debate the merits of the war and our post-war intelligence, and I want to make it very clear that the Congressional Black Caucus has and will continue to support our troops. We see them as some very brave men and women who every day go out in sometimes 130 degree heat, in difficult circumstances, in many instances not having the proper equipment that they need although we paid for it; and yet and still they go out, and they give the best they have. So we honor them.

We read newspaper accounts here and television reports of another soldier killed in Iraq by a roadside bomb, and we are momentarily touched; but, ultimately, Mr. Speaker, after the moment has passed, our lives continue on. Unfortunately, the lives of the five soldiers who are reported to have died in Iraq from my home State of Maryland will not continue on. The families of Command Sergeant Major Cornell W. Gilmore, 45 years old; Lieutenant Kylan A. Jones, 31 years old; Corporal Jason David Mileo, 20 years old; Specialist George A. Mitchell, 35 years old; and Staff Sergeant Kendall Damon Waters-Bey, 29 years old. He was one who was either the second or third person to lose his life in Iraq, and we just want it made very clear that our prayers are with the families and friends of these strong and wonderful people.

Mr. Speaker, please do not mistake my intentions. I am not invoking the names and memories of our troops to fulfill any political purpose. Whatever the political affiliation of these soldiers and their families, they deserve

to be remembered and honored for swearing to protect our freedoms and for laying down their lives in the pursuit of their mission.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of these courageous Americans that so many of my colleagues and I in the Congressional Black Caucus vehemently opposed launching war on Iraq. As elected representatives, we realize that the decisions we make here in the Congress of the United States of America reach far beyond these hallowed halls. We understand that the price of war cannot be captured in any budget.

Speaking of moneys appropriated by the Congress, just today we read in the news reports that Halliburton will be returning some \$27 million to the Government of the United States because it overcharged our government; and I tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, it bothers me because I shall never forget that when the Congressional Black Caucus and others got up before this war started and began to talk about this war and began to address the issues of why we were going to do this preemptive strike when it seemed that inspections were working, when we talked about it was so important and we emphasized that we not lose lives if we could avoid it, when we asked the question how all of this would be paid for and we could not get the President to meet with us or even talk to us, but here and then we were called by some unpatriotic, unpatriotic. I ask the question, if that was unpatriotic, what is it when we have a corporation during a time of war that turns around and has to return some \$27 million to the Treasury of the United States of America? That is a key question, and is that patriotic? I would submit to my colleagues that it is not.

The key is that as we debate over and over again the 9 million people who are unemployed in this country, when we debate over and over again the fact that there are 44 million people who have no health insurance, when we debate over and over again the fact that so many of our people are going through so many difficult circumstances, and then we think that as April 15 approaches people will be making sure that they write those checks out to the Government of this United States and then we turn around and find out that we have been overcharged \$27 million, something is absolutely wrong with that picture.

Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with our auditing and oversight if a company like Halliburton can be paid that much for something they did not provide. The price of war is far greater than the original \$79 billion funding request and even greater than the \$87 billion supplemental request that Congress doled out to support the war effort last year.

The price of war is the human blood spilled in Iraq's deserts. The price of war are the tears of children shed over flag-draped caskets. The price of war are the widowed wives and husbands

working a second job or collecting government assistance to support their families. The price of war is the young man who I ran into at BWI Airport the other day who said that he was a Reservist and because of the war he was not getting the type of money that he would normally get and he and his wife not only were getting divorced but the fact is that he was trying to find a way to file for bankruptcy.

War and death are inextricably linked, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, in our considerations to authorize war, we must decide whether the cause is great enough to die for. Mr. Speaker, I believe that fighting for freedom is always a worthy cause. As Martin Luther King once said, "An injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

However, Mr. Speaker, that is not how the urgency of this war was communicated to the American public. President Bush did not initially come to the American people and say that we must engage our military forces to remove Saddam Hussein because he is a bad dictator and is oppressing his people. Rather, the President very clearly, time and time again, told the American people that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and must be disarmed.

On October 16, 2002, the President said, "The Iraqi regime is a serious and growing threat to peace. On the commands of a dictator, the regime is armed with biological and chemical weapons, possesses ballistic missiles, promotes international terror and seeks nuclear weapons."

On January 16, 2003, President Bush, as the Commander in Chief, said, "In the name of peace, if he does not disarm," talking about Saddam Hussein, "I will lead a coalition of the willing to disarm Saddam Hussein."

The message was clear and the stage was set. The United States had to deploy our troops and disarm Saddam Hussein.

But early last year, Mr. Speaker, we noticed a rather curious phenomenon. As the polling numbers for American approval of the war adjusted, so did the rationale the administration used to convince the American public that this war was not necessary.

Former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill is quoted as saying that he was surprised that no one in a National Security Council meeting ever asked why Iraq should be invaded. He was shocked, when he probably could have predicted that there would be so much death, that there would be so much harm not only to our American soldiers but to innocent Iraqi people by the thousands. He sat there shocked that no one asked the question why are we going to invade Iraq.

In a recently published book describing the operations of the Bush White House, Secretary O'Neill says, "It was all about finding a way to do it. That was the tone of it. The President saying go find me a way to do this."

Mr. Speaker, the conscience of the Nation should be shocked and awed by

this sort of back-door and backup policy-making. The lives of our American soldiers should not have been bartered away in closed-door meetings between people whose own children are not asked to stand in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think of Staff Sergeant Kendall Waters-Bey. The family of United States Marine Staff Sergeant Kendall Damon Waters-Bey is from my district. In fact, his family used to live about five blocks away from my home. Mr. Speaker, the words of his father will forever be ingrained in the DNA of my memory. As he held a picture of his son, Michael Waters-Bey, he said, "I want the President to get a good look at this, really good look here. This is the only son I had, only son."

□ 1945

I ask, Mr. Speaker, was Mr. Waters-Bey's son at the forefront of the National Security Council's consciousness as they made their decision to take this country into war? I would think not, because otherwise I am sure they would have come to a different conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, if you remember, in November of 2002, the United States called for U.N. weapons inspectors to comb Iraq in search of hidden weapons of mass destruction. After 4 months, the weapons inspectors found nothing. Then, the United States concluded that it was our responsibility, our right to invade Iraq forcibly and disarm Saddam Hussein. During that time, Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and I came to this House floor urging, begging, pleading, and petitioning this President to give the inspections process a chance. We asked the President to work with our international allies to exhaust every diplomatic option possible before deploying American troops to disarm Hussein. Yet our letters and pleas went unanswered.

Now here we are today, almost a year later, Mr. Speaker. It has been almost a year since we declared the U.N. inspections process to be ineffective, almost a year after the first soldier died in Iraq. Almost a year later and we still have not found any weapons of mass destruction. Yes, we have found Saddam Hussein but, no, we have not found any weapons of mass destruction. It is interesting that Saddam Hussein is still alive and over 500 of our bravest men and women in uniform are not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the Secretary of State, Secretary Powell, in a recent Washington Post interview, saying that if he had been told that Iraq did not possess stockpiles of banned weapons, he is not sure that he would have supported the Iraq invasion. Almost a year to this day, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Powell told the U.N., and I quote, "Our conservative estimate is that Iraq today has a stockpile of between 100 and 500 tons of chemical weapon agents. That is enough to fill 16,000 battlefield rockets." Yet just last

week, former chief U.S. weapons inspector David Kay told a Senate committee that, and I quote, "Iraq's large-scale capability to develop, produce, and fill new chemical weapons munitions was reduced, if not entirely destroyed, during Operation Desert Storm and Desert Fox. Thirteen years of U.N. sanctions and inspections."

Considering these facts, Mr. Speaker, we must ask ourselves if the ultimate goal of this preemptive war was to disarm Saddam Hussein, was our mission really accomplished? Could we have reached the same end by utilizing a different means? If we had enough intelligence to determine that Saddam was hiding chemical and biological weapons from the U.N. inspectors, then why has the Intelligence Community not been able to lead us to those weapons? Mr. Speaker, something is wrong with this picture.

I am glad the President has finally agreed that there should be a commission to look into the apparent intelligence failures, but the Congress should have a role in that selection process. In the name of the over 500,000 troops that were deployed in Iraq, I call on the President to ensure that this process remains immune from election year politics, and I call on the President to hold himself and his administration accountable for the findings of any commission report.

Mr. Speaker, last year, around this time, the President addressed a group of Governors and said, and I quote, "The country expects leaders to lead." I would agree with President Bush on that point. The country expects leaders to lead and not to mislead the American people blindly down a path of war.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ensure that this evening is a somber occasion because it is a dialogue with our colleagues and one we hope will not be mired in politics but in truth. I stand somewhat, Mr. Speaker, with tears in my eyes. The chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus has convened this Special Order, and I am grateful to him for his continued leadership, and I look forward to working with the caucus to provide a voice and a message not only to the American people but to our colleagues.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart and tears in my eyes because we are talking about life-and-death matters; peace and war. I almost wish, Mr. Speaker, I could turn back the hands of time, turn back the clock, and find ourselves on the floor of the House on that fateful fall of 2002. Out of respect for their families, I will just call them by their first names, but maybe Private Ray David, out of San Antonio, who died during the Christmas holiday would still be alive; and maybe Armando, who was a private in

the United States Army, who died just 12 hours ago, might still be alive; or maybe Irving, who died just about 5 or 6 days ago, from Fort Worth, Armando being from Houston and Irving being from Fort Worth Texas, might still be alive.

This is not a frivolous discussion, Mr. Speaker. It is a very serious discussion. I think I would like to raise with my colleagues a discussion of what do we do next. There are families whose pain will never leave them, the pain of the loss of their young child, son or daughter, will forever be with them. Our respect and admiration for those brave young men and women will forever be a mark on our souls. We will honor them each Memorial Day, we will cite them year after year, some 500 and growing.

There are names that many of us will never know. Included in that, of course, are the loss of civilian lives in Iraq, lives for which the leaders of our government have said were innocent lives, some even have been children. The turmoil in Iraq speaks to the fact that this is a somber and sobering time. So I rise today because my challenge is whether or not the Congress will perform its duty.

Let me also acknowledge a veteran and friend and respected member of this House who we will hear from shortly, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). I would like to say to him that I look forward to joining him in commemorating the fallen soldiers as we proceed in this session, because I think that is extremely important.

But I rise this evening for a different challenge of this Congress. Yes, the President has accepted the constant request and inquiry for a commission. He has done so by embracing it and putting it close to the bosom of the administration. It is one appointed by the administration, dominated by the administration, run by the administration. And I ask my colleagues, does the Constitution, in establishing three branches of government, want us to abdicate our congressional duty of oversight over the executive branch? They are independent branches, judiciary, executive and legislative, but just as we have the responsibility of the purse strings in the House, we also have the responsibility of oversight over operations and policies of the President and the administration.

So I believe it is imperative that this Congress, whether it is a parallel duty, an action, or whether or not it substitutes for this commission, I believe it is imperative that this Congress wage its own investigation as to the reasons and the basis of the use of intelligence that generated a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq.

So I intend to offer the Protect America's National Security Act of 2004 that will call on full congressional hearings, no holds barred, if you will, to use a phrase that we often utilize, questioning what intelligence was used in the decision of the administration to go to war, how that intelligence was

analyzed, and on what basis was it utilized to convince the Congress, the representation to Members of Congress, that weapons of mass destruction existed. How was that intelligence gathered, who gathered it, who analyzed it, and how was it presented to Members of Congress for the decision to be made in a resolution that a preemptive unilateral attack should be made? I believe also that the American people need to know.

Finally, included in this bill, I want to ensure that the general amount, the bottom-line figure utilized by this government in intelligence gathering, the budget of the CIA, should be produced to the American people. Mr. Speaker, not the line-by-line item, not to give them an excuse that we are now intruding on secured matters, but to give the American people the lump sum as to how much is being utilized. They deserve to know and we would not be violating any security for doing so.

This legislation will also include more resources for more trained intelligence analysts, more analysts trained in Arabic, more recruitment of diverse analysts, if you will, and then it would have a provision that would enhance the checks and balances on the use of intelligence that would be placed as a basis for going to war with any country in any Nation. The Protect America's National Security Act of 2004.

It is imperative that for the lives lost, for the tears shed, for the mothers crying, for the fathers' broken hearts, for the wives in complete confusion, for the children without fathers, sisters without brothers, brothers without sisters, aunts and uncles that are missing, we need and owe this to the American people.

I simply would say, Mr. Speaker, that we can now look at language from the Vice President of the United States on August 26, 2002: "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction."

"Right now Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons." President Bush, September 12, 2002.

"The Iraqi regime possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons and is seeking nuclear weapons." President Bush, October 7, 2002.

On what basis were they making these statements? This cannot be left to a bipartisan commission selected by the President, even if it is represented to be bipartisan. Congress must do its duty.

"We have also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unarmed aerial vehicles that would be used to disburse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas. We are concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using UVAs for missions targeting the United States." Again, President Bush, October 7, 2002. Yet the Carnegie report of just a few months ago, and David Kay has indicated there are no weapons of mass destruction. There were no weapons of

mass destruction at the time that the President and the administration represented to this Congress and the American people that they existed.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, why is this important? It is important because we have to go on. Now the President comes to us with a budget that has a deficit of over \$500 billion. He offers to the American people \$4.1 trillion in tax cuts because he is asking to make his tax cuts permanent for 1 percent of Americans. Then he provides a gift to the American people, \$10,368, a burden for each family of four, making tax cuts permanent. At the same time he increases the burden on veterans by increasing their copayments, closing veterans hospitals, and denying access to health care.

I believe this Special Order tonight is so crucial because it raises for the American people a challenge to them standing up for their destiny, their destiny as to whether or not we remain in Iraq and lives continue to be lost. But more importantly is the question of whether or not we have now a road map that will lead us to war with other countries around the world unilaterally and preemptively. That is why I believe it is crucial for the American public to stand up and be heard on the Protect America's National Security Act of 2004, demanding this House and Senate to do its job with a full and comprehensive investigation.

Lives that were lost, those willing to go into harm's way, did not for a moment stop and ask the question why. They were called to duty. They took an oath of office. They were National Guard, Reservists, and enlisted personnel; and they went willingly on behalf of the United States of America. They died on the fields of battle, their blood shed because of us. We in this Congress who still live owe them not only a debt of gratitude but we owe them the truth. We owe our Reservists an extension of their benefits, the ability to retire at 55, and we owe them the greatest understanding of the sacrifice that they have made.

In closing, as my colleague indicated, we have all visited the young men and women in our hospitals, Bethesda Naval and Walter Reed. Their faces are bright with a sense of hope and duty. They talk about the tragedy of their loss, lost limbs, lost spirit; but they remain undaunted, willing to serve again.

I cannot imagine that this Congress, many of whom stood on the floor of this House and cried as they debated the resolution to make the choice of giving the President unfettered authority to go to war, I cannot now imagine that this Congress would refuse its duty for finding out the truth on behalf of those who were sent to war by our vote, by those who voted for it, and then of course then sent these young men and women off to war and refuse to now stand to find out the truth. We hope that that will occur.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we make sure that this occurs as we move forward in this year.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the Congressional Black Caucus I have often said that many of us are truly honored to have two of our founders of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the next gentleman, to speak. That we are able to serve with them is a tremendous honor because they bring so much wisdom and history to us and so much excellent guidance. Certainly the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is one of those gentlemen. I say to the gentleman that as he has consistently pressed on this war in trying to make this President and this Nation look at war as something of last resort, we appreciate it. We will join you as you salute all of our soldiers who have given so much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for giving some of us an opportunity to show what patriots we really are and how much we love this country, which has given us one of the highest opportunities, and that is to serve in this House of Representatives.

On November 30, 1950, I found myself shot by the Communist Chinese on the northern border of North Korea. When it was all over, I thanked God I had my life with the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star and came home and felt I was a patriot. That fighting was to give all Americans the opportunity, some that had been denied my forefathers, to participate fully, to support our government when we thought she was right and to be patriotic enough to be able to criticize our government when we thought she was wrong.

I think we in the Congressional Black Caucus have even a higher responsibility than a lot of Members of Congress because our constituents believe in us so much that they give us the latitude to express their concerns and to talk about their aspirations as well as their fears. That is one of the reasons why we do not have to take polls, we do not have to get on the phone and ask them what do you think about the war. But we know that as great as this country is, that one of our responsibilities is to make certain that she is all that she can be; and it is our responsibility, as our forefathers before us, to take it to that higher level, and we cannot do that if the resources of this country are depleted or we find our youth are not there to pick up the baton and take it to a higher level.

If this country can decide because we do not like somebody or we think that person is a threat or because they have demonized their own people or they have talked in a way that we do not like against the United States, that we can have a preemptive strike and remove that person, and then we find out

later as we find every day that the information we relied on was faulty, what happens if next time the information is reliable but just no one believes us? What happens when the President says that there is an imminent threat against the United States of America, and then we find that Americans and the Congress say, yes, we have heard that before.

It just seems to me that those people who voted to give the President this authority felt in their hearts that there was an imminent threat to the United States of America. But I listened carefully to the President changing all of the reasons that he had given for why he asked this Nation to send its young people to Iraq in a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq and Saddam Hussein. There used to be a time when he would talk about the relationship to al Qaeda. There used to be a time when he talked about weapons of mass destruction. There used to be a time that he talked about an imminent threat to the United States of America.

But if I hear him correctly now, he is saying, what difference does it make, we got rid of Saddam Hussein. What difference does it make? It makes the difference if the President had come here to the House of Representatives and said, do you want to get rid of Saddam Hussein. We probably would have had a unanimous vote, yes, we do. But what if the next question was: Are you prepared to give us 532 lives of young people in order to do it?

Suppose he said the price to get rid of this international terrorist was to have 2,000 men and women maimed and crippled and in our hospitals. Suppose he said in this war the Secretary of Defense would report to the American people, albeit by a leak, that he did not know if we were winning this war or not even after these losses. Suppose, further, Mr. Rumsfeld would say he had no clue whether or not we were creating more terrorists than we were killing. Suppose he said that he was just thinking out of the box, but in his opinion the whole thing was a slog.

Suppose he said that in addition to having our young men and women who love this country and salute the flag every time it goes up, that enlisted into the Army coming from our inner cities and rural areas in order to get a better education and better handle on life, or like some of us who volunteered, that we could not make it economically and this was an opportunity to get better training. Suppose he said even though they had 3-, 6-, and 9-year enlistments, that they would give them additional time to serve because it was a national emergency, suppose the President had told us when he asked the Congress to take out Saddam Hussein that 20 percent of the soldiers over there would be men and women from the Reservists and the National Guard.

Suppose he said they would not be all young people, they would be 30, 40, 50, even 60 years old. They would have to

give up their civilian jobs, and some have already served the military. Suppose he said they would have a drop in their income from their civilian pay, and these people who go away for weekends and 2 weeks to train would now have to be separated from their wives and families for over a year. Suppose he had said that they would have to go to Iraq two and three times and that soon these civilian soldiers will be 40 percent of the occupation of Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, suppose he had said that we are running out of people and that we would have to consider a draft, that we are talking about our Nation will have to make a sacrifice in order to remove terrorism from this region of the world, and everybody had to share in the sacrifice. Members of Congress, their children and grandchildren would be drafted, members of the cabinet would be drafted. Suppose he said in order to get rid of this demon, all of these things would be necessary, I wonder whether or not the President would have gotten the vote if we knew all of these facts.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am saying it is so important for us to be able to alert America that this whole idea of removing Saddam Hussein had absolutely nothing to do with the terrible strike that the terrorists had in my beloved City and State of New York. The President, by the admission of Secretary O'Neill and other competent writings, had already planned to remove Saddam Hussein, that the whole concept of a preemptive strike was a part of our foreign policy, and it was the tragic event of 9/11 that allowed him to connect an idea that they already decided to do, taking advantage of the emotion of the Members of Congress who thought they were reflecting the emotion of the people in the United States.

If we just allow this to go by, if we do not have competent outside investigations and if our Secretary of State said he did not know if he would have gone to the U.N. and supported this invasion if that information had been there, then what happens if we do have another crisis and that is the situation that is before us?

So I ask the Congress to do this, please do not forget our true fallen heroes. It is not the ones that just return home; it is those that come home in the darkness of night. We do not even know whether we have a flag over their coffin because the press are forbidden to be there. We ask that those of us in the Congress form a caucus for these fallen heroes to be there for their families and kids and to make certain that we are treating them not like we are treating the veterans in the budget today, but that we make a commitment that even though they are not our kids in terms of being our biological kids or grandkids, they are the children of our Nation and we have made a commitment that we are going to protect them.

□ 2015

And we are going to raise the standard before we go to war to make certain that our Nation is being threatened. Going over there and having people being killed by land mines, just standing up as sitting ducks or falling helicopters, that is not what you call fighting for America. That is being put in a no-win position and we are losing the life of one American a day.

I am asking Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, be patriotic, be patriots. Sometimes it takes a little courage and we have to explain to our voters and our constituents what we are talking about. But we do not have a draft. Some Members do not know the pain the families are going through, and the President says that some Americans do not even know we are at war. Mr. President, the families of those that have been struck in Iraq, they know we are at war. We in the Congressional Black Caucus would like to educate the American people that war is hell and we should never, never, never go to war if we can negotiate a peace.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. I really appreciate what he has said. We thank him for his service to this country in so many, many ways.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) who night after night and day after day before this war started came to this floor and laid out a brilliant case, over and over again, as to why we should not be going to war. If there was anybody in this entire Congress, Mr. Speaker, who could say I told you so, it would be the gentlewoman from California. I have absolutely no doubt that this is an issue that tears at her heart every time she hears about another person being harmed in Iraq.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for organizing this Special Order and I too commend him for taking so much of his time to organize us to come to this floor to help shed light on what is going on in this Congress and in this world. I look forward to every opportunity that he affords me to participate.

The massive costs of the war and how they will affect Americans in their everyday lives is an incredibly important issue that we must continue to discuss. This past Monday, the President sent his fiscal year 2005 budget to Congress. We found out that under this President's guidance, the Nation's debt has grown to record numbers. This year alone, the deficit is expected to be at least \$521 billion. And the national debt has grown by \$1.7 trillion since 2001. Yet instead of taking the necessary steps to bring our fiscal house into order, the President has proposed more of his failed policies.

I am having an interesting time, Mr. Speaker, discussing this with my friends. They say to me, MAXINE WATERS, I thought that you were the one

that has been accused of being one of those tax-and-spend liberals but now your President has outdone you. He is spending money like a drunken sailor. How can you explain it?

I say to him, I cannot explain it, but it falls into that category of misdirection, of tales that are being told that just do not hold up when you place them under scrutiny.

The President's budget is extremely dangerous. It calls for eliminating 38 education programs and cutting funding for dozens of others. It does virtually nothing for the 43 million Americans who have no health insurance. It cuts \$1.6 billion from HUD's section 8 voucher program and an additional \$130 million from public housing. The President's budget even cuts, by 7 percent, programs designed to protect our drinking water, keep our air clean and other important environmental programs.

The budget even calls for imposing copayments and enrollment fees for our veterans in order to receive health care for their injuries sustained while protecting our Nation. I find it appalling that our President would require our veterans to pay up to \$250 enrollment fees in order to receive the care they need. But these are just a few examples of the administration's policies that penalize working Americans. The war in Iraq is a continuation of these policies. It is the working American that is fighting, dying and paying for this war. The wealthiest of Americans, on the other hand, are not being asked to make any of these sacrifices. None are serving themselves, and few if any have sons or daughters in the U.S. Armed Forces. And they are the beneficiaries of hundreds of billions of dollars in tax cuts which makes it increasingly difficult to pay for this war.

To date, the President has asked for and received \$157 billion for this war in Iraq. Amazingly, recent press reports suggest that the President will ask for another additional \$50 million shortly after the next election for military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. This will bring the total to \$206 billion. What is so disappointing, though not surprising, is the difference between what we were told the costs would be for this war and what the costs are turning out to be. Throughout the buildup to the war, and even during the early stages, the American people were assured that the costs would be minimal. Who can forget Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz' statement in March of 2003 when he said, "We're dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon." But the sad reality is that it is the American people who are paying for this war.

Mr. Speaker, as we look at this administration and this war, we cannot help but now understand why the American people are finally waking up to how they have been misled and misdirected by this President and this administration. Of course, we heard ref-

erences tonight to the reason we were told we were going into this war and we must say it over and over again; we did a preemptive strike because Saddam Hussein and Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and we were in imminent danger. We were told this over and over again and Colin Powell even had some maps. He pointed to some sheds where chemicals were being made and the weapons of mass destruction were being developed.

But we have been misled on many things by this President and now we find ourselves in a terrible situation in Iraq. We are not in control. Our soldiers are dying, being picked off one by one. Suicide bombings are taking place. Soldiers are losing their lives. I am sure their families are asking, why? Or what does this all mean? Not only are they losing their lives, we were told after the President could no longer support or justify the weapons of mass destruction that we really needed a regime change, that we had to be about the business of creating democracy in Iraq. Now we are at the point where our President has said they are going to turn over governance to the Iraqis, only to find out that this President does not want free and fair elections, he does not want free and fair elections because, oh, somebody may win that he does not like. And I want you to know that the protests are growing in Iraq about the fact that this President now wants to select and choose who will be in charge of Iraq. He wants to put in a council through some kind of caucuses to avoid the Shiites being in control, because they may be the ones that get elected in this war as opposed to the Sunnis that they would like to have elected. But whether we are talking about Iraq or Afghanistan, we really did not have a plan. We really thought we could just bomb everybody into submission, take over the oil fields and chop up the spoils. And are we disappointed.

My goodness, how much more insult do the American people have to take from this administration? Here we have the Vice President of the United States of America, Mr. DICK CHENEY, who is still receiving paychecks from his old company, Halliburton. And what have we found out about Halliburton? They are cheating us right and left. Not only have they overcharged us for the oil they are importing from Kuwait to Iraq, we find out they are cheating us on the amount of the food that they are serving to our soldiers. They are giving us extraordinary numbers, only to find out that they are not really serving the numbers that they represent.

I talked about some of this last night, but it goes on and on and on. We are paying for a war that we should not have been in in the first place. We are paying contractors who are cheating us like Halliburton, who are getting no-bid contracts, and there is no end to all of this. This administration is going to have to pay a price for what it has

done. I am glad that we are here talking about it this evening.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's rhetoric does not support the situation we find ourselves in today. We were not welcomed as liberators, there are no weapons of mass destruction, hundreds of U.S. soldiers are dying, and taxpayers are paying billions of dollars for a war that need not be fought. Meanwhile, our responsibilities here at home are being neglected.

The Senate's ricin scare yesterday reminds us that our homeland is not as secure as it should be. Our schools continue to be in disrepair and hundreds of thousands of workers are losing their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reassess our priorities. Unfortunately, this budget does not do any of these things. There is so much more we can say, but I am going to yield my time to our leader here so that he can wrap this up tonight. But we have more to say and we will be back again because the American public wants to hear from us.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement. I also want to thank her for her compassion. And so it is tonight, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus, which has earned the title of being the conscience of the Congress, but I often say the conscience of the Nation, has come together to try to address these issues. As the gentleman from New York and as the gentlewoman from California stated very clearly, what we are about this evening is trying to make sure that we let the American people know what is going on, because we believe that they need to know and they need to understand what goes on in this Congress and how it affects them on a daily basis.

But the fact still remains that there are families tonight who are sitting watching this, and they are asking the question, as the gentlewoman from California said, of why is it that my son is no longer with me? Or why is it that my mother is no longer with me, a child may say.

But the fact is that we must be clear. We have asked this President over and over again to meet with the Congressional Black Caucus which represents over 26 million people. And as I have often said, they are not just African American people. As a matter of fact, more than a third of them are white. The fact is that we believe very strongly that when we come to this floor, we are speaking for America. And so it is, Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus urges our constituents and urges the Nation to pay close attention to all that is going on with regard to this war and all that is not.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, last year, I led the opposition to a pre-emptive war in Iraq—which, according to testimony given this week by former top U.S. Weapons Inspector David Kay, wasn't even pre-emptive. If Saddam Hussein had no weapons of mass destruction program, what potential harm were we preempting?

President Bush has led our country further and further away from the fold of the international community, ignoring the United Nations Security Council's findings, and virtually demolishing the international support we had received following September 11th. He has challenged Americans to a "you're either with us or against us" agenda, which leads to the most dangerous kind of patriotism—where questioning and dissent are considered un-American. Well I, as an American and a patriot, am now standing again to ask questions about the cost of this war.

We spent \$396 billion in military spending alone for 2003. As big as this number is, it does not even include the cost of the Iraq war, which was funded through two additional supplemental requests; the first for \$79 billion, the second was another \$87 billion. Together, that amounts an amazing \$562 billion. For 2003, that amounts to almost \$11 billion dollars spent ever week, and more than \$1.5 billion spent every day. Compare that to this year's Department of Education budget of \$54 billion, which works out to less than 150 million dollars per day, which averages out to less than \$3 million per day in education spending in each state. \$1.5 billion on the military, \$3 million on education: so where are our priorities?

Here at home, 9 million Americans are unemployed, 35 million live under the official poverty line, 44 million have no health insurance, and millions more are unable to make ends meet. States face their worst fiscal crisis since the Great Depression, and the yearly federal budget deficit is passing \$500 billion and growing rapidly. My own state, New Jersey, is facing a projected \$5 billion budget deficit for 2004.

And this administration doesn't intend to change course anytime soon. According to the 2005 budget released this week, they are planning to spend \$2.2 trillion on the military over the next 5 years.

For 2004 alone, they plan to spend \$399 billion on the military (which does not include any possible future supplemental funding requests for Iraq or Afghanistan) which is more than the combined spending that year for education, Health, Justice, Housing Assistance, International Affairs, Veterans Benefits, Natural Resources & Environment, Science & Space, Transportation, employment, Employment Training, Social Services, Income Security, Economic Development, Social Security, Medicare, Agriculture, and Energy.

Where we spend our money is a telling sign of where our priorities lie. We have abandoned our children, our teachers, our laborers, our homeless, our veterans, and our seniors in order to fund these regime-changing, unilateral military actions. We are under funding No Child Left Behind, IDEA, after-school programs, and family literacy programs. We have not extended unemployment benefits for those without jobs. We have offered our seniors a Medicare program that does almost nothing to cut their prescription drug costs, and we're threatening to destabilize their Social Security through privatization.

I am very concerned about the direction in which our country is headed. We're sliding further and further down a slippery slope where our country's basic needs are not being met. That is why this year's presidential election is so key. We need a leader that can mend the relationships broken by this unnecessary war and its ill-administered aftermath. We need to

bring home the tens of thousands men and women whose lives have been placed on the line for no good reason. We must see change for the better.

More numbers:

For the cost of every cluster bomb, we can enroll 2 children in Head Start.

For the cost of every minute of the war on Iraq, we could have paid the annual salary and benefits for 15 registered nurses. For every hour of the war on Iraq, we could improve, repair, and modernize 20 schools. For the cost of one day's war on Iraq, we could have prevented all of the budget cuts to education programs in 2003. For the amount of money we spend ever week in Iraq, we could build 142,857 units of affordable housing. For the amount of money we spend to buy one stealth bomber, we could pay the annual salary plus benefits for 38,000 teachers. We might be able to give a few of them a raise—image that!

Each day the Pentagon spends \$1.7 billion, which is enough to build 200 new elementary schools, house 136,000 homeless, or provide Pell grants to one million college students (per day!).

With less than the cost of ONE of the Iraq supplementals, we could do all these things: Provide basic health and food to the world's poor: \$12 billion. Rebuild America's public schools over 10 years: \$12 billion. Reduce class size for grades 1–3 to 15 students per class: \$11 billion. Reduce debts of impoverished nations: \$10 billion; Provide health insurance to all uninsured American kids: \$6 billion; Increased federal funding for clean energy and energy efficiency: \$6 billion; Public financing of all federal elections: \$1 billion; Fully fund Head Start: \$2 billion.

Other countries military spending: Russia—\$65 billion; China—\$47 billion; Japan—\$42.6 billion; U.K.—\$38.4 billion.

These combined are a total of \$193 billion, which is less than half our FY '03 or FY '04 military spending—not including the cost of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Please don't confuse military spending with the safety and security of our Nation. It is a common misconception that higher military enhances homeland security. However, many of these responsibilities fall onto our struggling, under funded State and local government agencies, whom we know as "first responders," and to agencies outside of the Defense Department, such as the FBI, FEMA, and the Coast Guard. This massive military spending budget addresses none of these programs.

Another matter of concern to me is not only how much money we're spending on our military, but how that money is being spent. The President's \$87 billion supplemental contained an astronomical waste of taxpayer dollars. These are just some of the administration's requests:

\$100 million for several new housing communities, complete with roads, schools, and a medical clinic; \$20 million for business classes, at a cost of \$10,000 per Iraqi student; \$900 million for imported kerosene and diesel, even though Iraq has huge oil reserves; \$54 million to study the Iraqi postal system; \$10 million for prison-building consultants; \$2 million for garbage trucks; \$200,000 each for Iraqis in a witness protection program; \$100 million for hundreds of criminal investigators; and \$400 million for two prisons, at a cost of nearly \$50,000 per bed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

□ 2030

REPORT ON TRIP TO LIBYA, IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, UZBEKISTAN, AND MILITARY HOSPITAL IN GERMANY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the topic of my Special Order this evening, and I think I will be joined by other Members from both sides, is our recent trip to Libya, Iraq, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan, and our military hospital for our troops in Germany. But before I get into my comments about the trip, let me put some specific quotes from Dr. Kay, who has just been referred to by a previous speaker, who made the allegation that Dr. Kay said there was no basis for our activity in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, let me put the actual quote in the RECORD, not something that is paraphrasing, but the actual quote. In an interview that Dr. Kay conducted on NBC TV, he was asked to comment on whether it was prudent to go to war. Dr. Kay said, "I think it was absolutely prudent. In fact, I think at the end of the inspection process, we will paint a picture of Iraq that was far more dangerous than we even thought it was before the war."

Mr. Speaker, that is not me paraphrasing; that is not me summarizing or putting my own spin on what Dr. Kay said. That is a direct quote from Dr. Kay, and the American people and our colleagues need to understand that as we analyze what has been said in the findings of the Kay report, that we actually look at those statements, as opposed to trying to spin them. Some of our colleagues on the other side, especially those running for the Presidency, have tried to put a spin on what Dr. Kay said. It is more important for the American people and for our colleagues to look at in actuality what he said.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one more point I want to make on this whole effort of the spin of Dr. Kay, which ties into our trip, because of the 45 meetings that we held over the 7 days, visiting eight different countries and traveling 25,500 miles in military aircraft, including a military aircraft to get over, a Navy plane, C-130s and